



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Northwest Region
7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Bldg. 1
Seattle, WA 98115

Refer to:
OSB2000-0297

January 29, 2001

Mr. Lawrence C. Evans
Chief, Regulatory Branch
Corps of Engineers, Portland District
ATTN: Judy Linton
P.O. Box 2946
Portland, Oregon 97232

Re: Section 7 Formal Consultation and Essential Fish Habitat Consultation for the Hayden Bay Condominium Marina Project, City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon (Corps No. 2000-01016)

Dear Mr. Evans:

On November 20, 2000, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) received a letter from the Corps of Engineers (COE) requesting formal consultation on the issuance of a permit for the Hayden Bay Condominium Marina Project (Corps No. 2000-01016). The project is located in Hayden Bay, a backwater of the Columbia River, in the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon. The proposed action is construction of a 19 slip marina for use by adjacent condominium owners.

Enclosed is the NMFS' biological opinion (Opinion) on the project. This Opinion addresses Snake River sockeye salmon, Snake River fall chinook salmon, Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon, Upper Columbia River spring run chinook salmon, Lower Columbia River chinook salmon, Columbia River chum salmon, Snake River Basin steelhead, Upper Columbia River steelhead, Middle Columbia River steelhead, and Lower Columbia River steelhead and constitutes formal consultation for these listed species. The NMFS has determined that the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of those listed species. An Incidental Take Statement provides non-discretionary terms and conditions to minimize the potential for incidental take of listed species.

In addition, this document also serves as consultation on Essential Fish Habitat for coho and chinook salmon under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR Part 600).



If you have any questions regarding this Opinion, please contact Ben Meyer of my staff in the Oregon State Branch Office at 503.230.5425.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Crouse - for:

Donna Darm
Acting Regional Administrator

bcc: F/NWR - K. Cunningham
F/NWR4 - File Copy, B. Meyer, M. Liverman
F/PR3 - Chief of Endangered Species
F/NWR4 - Web Page (electronic only)

File Log #: 8717
OSB § 7 #: OSB2000-0297
Nat. § 7#: 2001/0
EFH Log #: yes ~

OSB File Location for Final Biological Opinions:
C:\habweb\bo\2001\osb2000-0297.wpd

Biologist File Location:
J:\BEN\CONSULTS\2000-1016\OSB2000-0297-Final_01-29-2001.wpd

Endangered Species Act
Section 7 Formal Consultation
Biological Opinion
&
Magnuson - Stevens Act
Essential Fish Habitat Consultation

Hayden Bay Condominium Marina Project,
the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon
(Corps No.: 2000-01016)

Agency: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Portland District

Consultation Conducted By: National Marine Fisheries Service,
Northwest Region

Date Issued: January 29, 2001

Refer to: OSB2000-0297

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND	1
2. PROPOSED ACTION	1
3. BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION AND CRITICAL HABITAT	2
4. EVALUATING PROPOSED ACTIONS	4
4.1. Biological Requirements	4
4.2. Environmental Baseline	5
5. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS	5
5.1. Effects of Proposed Action	5
5.2. Critical Habitat	7
5.3. Cumulative Effects	7
6. CONCLUSION	8
7. REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION	8
8. INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT	8
8.1. Amount or Extent of the Take	9
8.2. Reasonable and Prudent Measures	9
8.3. Terms and Conditions	9
9. ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT CONSULTATION	10
10. LITERATURE CITED	11
Table 1. Species considered in this Opinion	1
Table 2. References for additional background on listing status, biological information, and critical habitat elements for the listed and proposed species addressed in this biological and conference opinion.	3

1. BACKGROUND

On November 17, 2000, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) sent a letter to Michael Crouse, of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), requesting formal consultation on the issuance of a permit for construction of the Hayden Bay Condominium Marina Project in the Columbia River (river mile 107) in the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon. Included with the letter was a biological assessment (BA) describing the effects of the project on 10 species of anadromous salmonids that are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The objective of this biological opinion (Opinion) is to determine whether issuance of the proposed permit is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of salmonid species listed under the ESA (Table 1), or result in the destruction or adverse modification of their critical habitat.

Table 1. Species considered in this Opinion

Common Name	Scientific Name
Columbia River chum salmon	<i>O. keta</i>
Lower Columbia River steelhead	<i>O. mykiss</i>
Middle Columbia River steelhead	<i>O. mykiss</i>
Upper Columbia River steelhead	<i>O. mykiss</i>
Snake River Basin steelhead	<i>O. mykiss</i>
Snake River sockeye salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus nerka</i>
Lower Columbia River chinook salmon	<i>O. tshawytscha</i>
Upper Columbia River spring run chinook salmon	<i>O. tshawytscha</i>
Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon	<i>O. tshawytscha</i>
Snake River fall chinook salmon	<i>O. tshawytscha</i>

2. PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action is issuance of a COE permit (Corps No. 2000-01016) under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act for the construction of a marina, consisting of 19 boat slips in Hayden Bay, a backwater area of the Columbia River, at Portland, Oregon. All docks will be no larger than six feet in width, with two feet of grating placed along the entire length of the main dock to provide for light penetration. The 18 piles necessary for anchoring the docks will be made of steel and capped to prevent usage by predatory birds.

3. BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION AND CRITICAL HABITAT

Based on migratory timing, it is not likely that any listed adult or juvenile salmon or steelhead would be present because construction is proposed to be completed during the normal in-water work period of November 1 to February 15. All listed species may also use the area as a resting and feeding area during the juvenile outmigration after construction is completed. The proposed action would occur within designated critical habitat for all of the species.

An action area is defined by ESA regulations (50 CFR Part 402) as “all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action.” The area within critical habitat affected by the proposed action is Hayden Bay (a backwater area created by dredging for placement of marinas) and the Columbia River in the vicinity of the project site. This area serves as a migratory corridor for both adult and juvenile life stages of all listed species under consideration in this Opinion. Essential features of the area for the species are: (1) Substrate, (2) water quality, (3) water quantity, (4) water temperature, (5) water velocity, (6) cover/shelter, (7) food (juvenile only), (8) riparian vegetation, (9) space, and (10) safe passage conditions. The essential features this proposed project may affect are water quality resulting from construction activities and safe passage conditions as a result of the structures placed in the river. Listing status and sources of additional information on critical habitats, protective regulations and biological requirements are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. References for additional background on listing status, biological information, and critical habitat elements for the listed and proposed species addressed in this biological and conference opinion.

Species	Listing Status	Critical Habitat	Protective Regulations	Biological Information, Historical Population Trends
Columbia River chum salmon	March 25, 1999; 64 FR 14508, Threatened	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Johnson <i>et al.</i> 1997; Salo 1991
Lower Columbia River steelhead	March 19, 1998; 63 FR 13347, Threatened	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Busby <i>et al.</i> 1995; 1996
Middle Columbia River steelhead	March 25, 1999; 64 FR 14517, Threatened	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Busby <i>et al.</i> 1995; 1996
Upper Columbia River steelhead	August 18, 1997; 62 FR 43937, Endangered	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Busby <i>et al.</i> 1995; 1996
Snake River Basin steelhead	August 18, 1997; 62 FR 43937, Threatened	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Busby <i>et al.</i> 1995; 1996
Snake River sockeye salmon	November 20, 1991; 56 FR 58619, Endangered	December 28, 1993; 58 FR 68543	November 20, 1991; 56 FR 58619	Waples <i>et al.</i> 1991a; Burgner 1991
Lower Columbia River chinook salmon	March 24, 1999; 64 FR 14308, Threatened	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Myers <i>et al.</i> 1998; Healey 1991
Upper Columbia River spring-run chinook salmon	March 24, 1999; 64 FR 14308, Endangered	February 16, 2000; 65 FR 7764	July 10, 2000; 65 FR 42423	Myers <i>et al.</i> 1998; Healey 1991
Snake River spring/summer-run chinook salmon	April 22, 1992; 57 FR 34653, Threatened	December 28, 1993; 58 FR 68543	April 22, 1992; 57 FR 14653	Matthews and Waples 1991; Healey 1991
Snake River fall chinook salmon	April 22, 1992; 57 FR 34653, Threatened	December 28, 1993; 58 FR 68543	April 22, 1992; 57 FR 14653	Waples <i>et al.</i> 1991b; Healey 1991

4. EVALUATING PROPOSED ACTIONS

The standards for determining jeopardy are set forth in Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA as defined by 50 CFR, Part 402 (the consultation regulations). NMFS must determine whether the action is likely to jeopardize the listed species and/or whether the action is likely to destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. This analysis involves the initial steps of: (1) Defining the biological requirements of the listed species, and (2) evaluating the relevance of the environmental baseline to the species' current status.

Subsequently, NMFS evaluates whether the action is likely to jeopardize the listed species by determining if the species can be expected to survive with an adequate potential for recovery. In making this determination, NMFS must consider the estimated level of mortality attributable to: (1) Collective effects of the proposed or continuing action, (2) the environmental baseline, and (3) any cumulative effects. This evaluation must take into account measures for survival and recovery specific to the listed salmon's life stages that occur beyond the action area. If NMFS finds that the action is likely to jeopardize, NMFS must identify reasonable and prudent alternatives for the action.

Furthermore, NMFS evaluates whether the action, directly or indirectly, is likely to destroy or adversely modify the listed species' critical habitat. The NMFS must determine whether habitat modifications appreciably diminish the value of critical habitat for both survival and recovery of the listed species. The NMFS identifies those effects of the action that impair the function of any essential element of critical habitat. The NMFS then considers whether such impairment appreciably diminishes the habitat's value for the species' survival and recovery. If NMFS concludes that the action will adversely modify critical habitat, it must identify any reasonable and prudent alternatives available. For the proposed action, NMFS's jeopardy analysis considers direct or indirect mortality of fish attributable to the action. NMFS's critical habitat analysis considers the extent to which the proposed action impairs the function of essential elements necessary for adult and juvenile migration of the listed species under the existing environmental baseline.

4.1. Biological Requirements

The first step in the method NMFS uses for applying the ESA standards of § 7 (a)(2) to listed salmon is to define the species' biological requirements that are most relevant to each consultation.

The relevant biological requirements are those necessary for the listed species to survive and recover to naturally reproducing population levels at which protection under the ESA would become unnecessary. Adequate population levels must safeguard the genetic diversity of the listed stocks, enhance their capacity to adapt to various environmental conditions, and allow them to become self-sustaining in the natural environment. For this consultation, the biological requirements are increased migration survival and improved habitat characteristics that function to support successful migration.

4.2. Environmental Baseline

The biological requirements of the listed species are currently not being met under the environmental baseline. Their status is such that there must be a significant improvement in the environmental conditions of the critical habitat over those currently available under the environmental baseline. Any further degradation of these conditions would have a significant impact due to the amount of risk the listed salmon presently face under the environmental baseline.

The Columbia River shoreline is undergoing substantial development. Residential houses are being constructed adjacent to the Columbia River with concurrent requests for private moorages and erosion control methods (riprap or beach nourishment). The proliferation of boat docks and individual piers within the migratory corridor may result in adverse cumulative effects to proposed critical habitat along the entire Columbia River. Piers are only one type of overwater structure which can cause adverse effects on critical habitat, thus the magnitude of the problem is significant.

5. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS

5.1. Effects of Proposed Action

The mainstem Columbia River is an important migration route for numerous species of anadromous fish. Steelhead juveniles are normally found mid-river during migration (Dawley et al. 1986). However, juvenile steelhead use backwater areas to overwinter and hold prior to migrating. Juvenile salmonids (chinook salmon, and cutthroat trout) utilize backwater areas during their outmigration (Parente and Smith 1981). In addition, the presence of predatory fish may force smaller prey fish species, such as juvenile salmonids, into less desirable habitats, disrupting foraging behavior, thereby resulting in less growth (Dunsmoor et al. 1991).

Depressed stocks of fish are susceptible to further reduction as a result of predation (Larkin 1979). Control of predators may provide a prey species the ability to cross a critical abundance threshold by increasing their survival (Larkin 1979). Providing temporary respite from predation may be the best way to increase Pacific salmon abundance (Larkin 1979). A substantial reduction in predators will generally result in an increase in prey abundance (Campbell 1979). Gray and Rondorf (1986) in evaluating predation in the Columbia River Basin state that “The most effective management program may be to reduce the susceptibility of juvenile salmonids to predation by providing maximum protection during their downstream migration.”

5.1.1. Over-water Structures

Native predator species such as northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*) and introduced predators such as largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*), black crappie (*Pomoxis nigromaculatus*) white crappie (*P. annularis*) and, potentially, walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum*) (Ward et al. 1994, Poe et al. 1991, Beamesderfer and Rieman 1991,

Rieman et al. 1991, Petersen et al. 1990, Pflug and Pauley 1984, and Collis et al. 1995) may occupy habitat created by over-water structures (Ward and Nigro 1992, Pflug and Pauley 1984) such as piers, float houses, floats and docks. Moreover, piscivorous birds may perch on pilings and increase their predation on salmonids. The extent of increase in predation on salmonids in the Columbia River resulting from over-water structures is not well known. As recommended in the *Proposed Recovery Plan for Snake River Salmon*, "there should be no programs that improve habitat, production or survival of introduced species" and that "recruitment of these species into habitats of the listed species should be curtailed" (NMFS 1995).

Major habitat types utilized by largemouth bass include vegetated areas, open water and areas with cover such as docks and submerged trees (Mesing and Wicker 1986). During the summer bass prefer pilings, rock formations, areas beneath moored boats, and alongside docks. Colle et al. (1989) found that, in lakes lacking vegetation, largemouth bass distinctly preferred habitat associated with piers, a situation analogous to the Columbia River. Marinas also provide wintering habitat for largemouth bass out of mainstem current velocities (Raibley et al. 1997). Bevelhimer (1996), in studies on smallmouth bass, indicates that ambush cover and low light intensities create a predation advantage for predators and can also increase foraging efficiency. Wanjala et al. (1986) found that adult largemouth bass in a lake were generally found near submerged structures suitable for ambush feeding. Bell (1991) states that predators may use sheltered areas of low velocity to attack. Ward (1992) found that stomachs of northern pikeminnow in developed areas of Portland Harbor contained 30% more salmonids than those in undeveloped areas, although undeveloped areas contained more pikeminnows.

Piscivorous fish use four major predatory strategies: (1) They run down prey; (2) ambush prey; (3) habituate prey to a non-aggressive illusion; or (4) stalk prey (Hobson 1979). Ambush predation is probably the most common predation strategy. When using the ambush method, predators lie-in-wait, then dart out at the prey in an explosive rush (Gerking 1994). Predators may use sheltered areas that provide slack water to ambush prey fish in faster currents (Bell 1991).

Light plays an important role in defense from predation. Prey species are better able to see predators under high light intensity, thus providing the prey species with an edge (Hobson 1979). Petersen and Gadomski (1994) found that predator success was higher at lower light intensities. Prey fish lose their ability to school at low light intensities, making them vulnerable to predation (Petersen and Gadomski 1994). Howick and O'Brien (1983) found that in high light intensities, prey species (bluegill) can locate largemouth bass before they are seen by the bass. However, in low light intensities, the bass can locate the prey before the prey see them. Walters et al. (1991) found that high light intensities may result in increased use of shade-producing structures by predators.

The construction of the proposed docks and piles may result in creation of habitat conducive to predaceous fish and increase the potential for further loss of out-migrating salmonids through direct predation. The effect of over-water structures is the creation of a light/dark interface. This allows ambush predators to remain in a darkened area that is barely visible to prey and watch for prey to swim

by against a bright, highly visible background. Prey species moving around the structure are unable to see predators in the dark area under the structure and are more susceptible to predation. The COE fisheries handbook (Bell 1991) states that "light and shadow paths are utilized by predators advantageously." The proposed grating in the docks would minimize or eliminate the light/dark interface, thereby reducing the potential for predators to successfully predate on juvenile salmonids that may utilize the area.

The pilings associated with the dock may serve as perching platforms for piscivorous birds. The proposed capping of the piles with anti-perching devices should minimize or eliminate potential use by birds.

Water quality may be degraded in the short-term as a result of turbidity created by construction activities associated with pile driving. However, turbidity should be localized and the proposed dates of construction during the in-water work window should minimize the potential of effects to listed salmonids.

5.2. Critical Habitat

As described in previous sections of this Opinion, the proposed project may affect essential features of the critical habitat of listed salmonids. The docks and piles may provide habitat for predaceous fish, thereby inhibiting safe passage for juvenile salmonids. The proposed minimization measures of: 1) Working within the in-water work period; 2) placing the dock as far from shore as possible; 3) the use of steel pilings rather than treated wood; 3) the use of aluminum gangways to reduce painting and maintenance; and 4) placing grating in the docks would minimize impacts associated with the modification of critical habitat for listed salmonids.

5.3. Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are defined in 50 CFR 402.02 as "those effects of future State or private activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation." For the purposes of this analysis, the action area encompasses the immediate area around the project site. Future Federal actions, including the ongoing operation of hydropower systems, hatcheries, fisheries, and land management activities are being (or have been) reviewed through separate section 7 consultation processes. The NMFS is not aware of any significant change in non-Federal activities that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area. Therefore, NMFS assumes that future private and state actions will continue at similar intensities as in recent years.

6. CONCLUSION

NMFS has determined that, based on the available information, the proposed Hayden Bay Condominium Marina project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species listed in Table 1 or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated and proposed critical habitat.

The NMFS reached this conclusion based on the applicant: 1) Incorporating design features that minimizes or eliminate the potential for increased foraging effectiveness by predatory fish species; 2) incorporating design features that minimizes or eliminates potential use of the facility by piscivorous birds; and 3) minimizing impacts to water quality resulting from construction activities.

7. REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION

Consultation must be reinitiated if: (1) The amount or extent of taking specified in the Incidental Take Statement is exceeded, or is expected to be exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the action may affect listed species in a way not previously considered; (3) the action is modified in a way that causes an effect on listed species that was not previously considered; or, (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat is designated that may be affected by the action (50 CFR 402.16).

8. INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Sections 4 (d) and 9 of the ESA prohibit any taking (harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct) of listed species without a specific permit or exemption. Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns such as breeding, feeding, and sheltering. Harass is defined as actions that create the likelihood of injuring listed species to such an extent as to significantly alter normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, and sheltering. Incidental take is take of listed animal species that results from, but is not the purpose of, the Federal agency or the applicant carrying out an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to, and not intended as part of, the agency action is not considered prohibited taking provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

The measures described below are non-discretionary; they must be implemented by the action agency so that they become binding conditions of any grant or permit issued to the applicant, as appropriate, in order for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. The COE has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered in this incidental take statement. If the COE 1) Fails to require the applicant to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms that are added to the permit or grant document, and/or (2) fails to retain the oversight to ensure compliance with these terms and conditions, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse.

An incidental take statement specifies the impact of any incidental taking of endangered or threatened species. It also provides reasonable and prudent measures that are necessary to minimize impacts and sets forth terms and conditions with which the action agency must comply in order to implement the reasonable and prudent measures.

8.1. Amount or Extent of the Take

The NMFS anticipates that the action covered by this Opinion has more than a negligible likelihood of resulting in incidental take of listed and proposed species because of predation by predaceous fish or birds utilizing in-water structures. The subject action, however, as described in this Opinion and modified by the reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions, is expected to result in a substantial decline in the extent of take. Effects of the action such as these are largely unquantifiable, but are not expected to be measurable as long-term effects on the species' habitat or population levels. The best scientific and commercial data available are not sufficient to enable NMFS to estimate a specific amount of incidental take to the listed species themselves. In instances such as these, the NMFS designates the expected level of take as "unquantifiable." Based on the information in the BA, the NMFS anticipates that an unquantifiable amount of incidental take could occur as a result of the action covered by this Opinion.

8.2. Reasonable and Prudent Measures

The NMFS believes that the following reasonable and prudent measure is necessary and appropriate to avoid take of the listed and proposed species.

1. The COE shall require that all in-water structures are constructed in such a way as to minimize their attractiveness to predaceous fish or bird species.

8.3. Terms and Conditions

In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the ESA, the COE must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the reasonable and prudent measures described above. These terms and conditions are non-discretionary.

1. To implement reasonable and prudent measure No. 1, above, the COE shall:
 - a. Inspect the site at the completion of construction to ascertain if the required construction standards have been met; and
 - b. Require all floating structures greater than 6' in width shall have a minimum of 2' of light permeable grating placed down the center line of the float the entire length of the structure.

- c. All pilings shall be fitted with devices to prevent perching by piscivorous bird species.

9. ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT CONSULTATION

The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) is one of eight regional fishery management councils established under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. PFMC develops and carries out fisheries management plans for salmon, groundfish and coastal pelagic species off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California, and recommends Pacific halibut harvest regulations to the International Pacific Halibut Commission.

As required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, PFMC described and identified Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in each of its fisheries management plans. EFH includes "those waters and substrates necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." The Columbia River estuary and the Pacific Ocean off the mouth of the Columbia River were designated as EFH for groundfish and coastal pelagic species,¹ and all streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, and other water bodies currently, or historically accessible to salmon in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California are designated as EFH for salmon.²

The Magnuson-Stevens Act also established an EFH consultation process. Federal agencies are required to consult with NMFS on all actions that may adversely affect EFH. The NMFS interprets the scope of these consultations to include actions by Federal agencies that occur outside designated EFH, such as upstream or upslope, but which nonetheless may have an adverse effect on habitat conditions necessary for the long-term survival of the species within EFH. The NMFS must provide conservation recommendations for any Federal or State activity that may adversely affect EFH. Within 30 days of receiving EFH conservation recommendations from the NMFS, Federal agencies must conclude EFH consultation by responding to NMFS with a written description of conservation measures the agency will use to avoid, mitigate or offset the impact of its action on EFH. If the Federal agency selects conservation measures which are inconsistent with the conservation recommendations of NMFS, the Federal agency must explain in writing its reasons for not following NMFS' recommendations.

¹ Pacific Fishery Management Council, Final Environmental Assessment/ Regulatory Review for Amendment 11 to the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (October 1998), and The Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan: Amendment 8 (December 1998). See, also, Casillas, *et al.*, Essential Fish Habitat West Coast Groundfish Appendix, National Marine Fisheries Service, 778 p. (1988).

² Pacific Fishery Management Council, Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan. Appendix A: Description and Identification of Essential Fish Habitat, Adverse Impacts and Recommended Conservation Measures for Salmon (1999).

The project area for the marina project occurs within the area designated as EFH for chinook and coho (*O. kisutch*) salmon. Information submitted by the COE is sufficient to conclude that the effects of this project on EFH are likely to be within the range of effects considered in the ESA portion of this consultation. Based on that analysis, the NMFS finds that the proposed project is likely to adversely affect EFH for coho salmon and chinook salmon.

The COE has provided for minimization of the potential impacts in the design of this project. The reasonable and prudent measures and the terms and conditions outlined above in Section 8 are applicable to designated groundfish and Pacific salmon EFH. Therefore, NMFS recommends that they be adopted as EFH conservation measures.

This concludes EFH consultation for the proposed project. The COE must reinitiate this EFH consultation if discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained or is authorized by law and if: 1) New information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect designated EFH in a manner or to an extent not considered in this consultation; 2) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to designated EFH not considered in this consultation; or 3) new EFH is designated that may be affected by the action.

10. LITERATURE CITED

- Beamesderfer, R.C. and B.E. Rieman. 1991. Abundance and Distribution of Northern Squawfish, Walleyes, and Smallmouth Bass in John Day Reservoir, Columbia River. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 120:439-447.
- Bell, M.C. 1991. Fisheries handbook of engineering requirements and biological criteria. Fish Passage Development and Evaluation Program. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. North Pacific Division.
- Bevelhimer, M.S. 1996. Relative importance of temperature, food, and physical structure to habitat choice by smallmouth bass in laboratory experiments. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 125:274-283.
- Burgner, R.L. 1991. Life history of sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). Pages 1-117 *In*: Groot, C. and L. Margolis (eds.). 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia Press.
- Busby, P.J., T.C. Wainwright, G.J. Bryant, L.J. Lieheimer, R.S. Waples, F.W. Waknitz, and I.V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-27, 261p.

- Campbell, K.P. 1979. Predation principles in large rivers: A review. Pages 181-191 in R.H. Stroud and H. Clepper, editors. Predator-prey systems in fisheries management. Sport Fishing Institute, Washington D.C.
- Colle, D.E., R.L. Cailteux, and J.V. Shireman. 1989. Distribution of Florida largemouth bass in a lake after elimination of all submersed aquatic vegetation. N. Am. Journal of Fish. Mgmt. 9:213-218.
- Collis, K., R.E. Beaty and B.R. Crain. 1995. Changes in Catch Rate and Diet of Northern Squawfish Associated With the Release of Hatchery-Reared Juvenile Salmonids in a Columbia River Reservoir. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 15:346-357.
- Dawley, E.M., R.D. Ledgerwood, T.H. Blahm, C.W. Sims, J.T. Durkin, R.A. Kim, A.E. Rankis, G.E. Monan and F.J. Ossiander. 1986. Migrational Characteristics, Biological Observations, and Relative Survival of Juvenile Salmonids Entering the Columbia River Estuary. Final Report of Research. Bonneville Power Administration Contract DE-AI79-84BP39652. Project No. 81-102. 256 pp.
- Dunsmoor, L.K., D.H. Bennett, and J.A. Chandler. 1991. Prey selectivity and growth of a planktivorous population of smallmouth bass in an Idaho reservoir. Pages 14-23 in D.C. Jackson (ed) The First International Smallmouth Bass Symposium. Southern Division American Fisheries Society. Bethesda, Maryland.
- Fox, D.S., S. Bell, W. Nehlsen, and J. Damron. 1984. The Columbia River Estuary Atlas of Physical and Biological Characteristics. Columbia River Estuary Data Development Program. 87 pp.
- Gerking, S.D. 1991. Feeding Ecology of Fish. Academic Press Inc., San Diego, CA. 416 pp.
- Gray, G.A. and D.W. Rondorf. 1986. Predation on juvenile salmonids in Columbia Basin reservoirs. Pages 178-185 in G.E. Hall and M.J. Van Den Avle eds. Reserv

- Healey, M.C. 1991. Life history of chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Pages 311-393
In: Groot, C. and L. Margolis (eds.). 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. Vancouver, British
 Columbia: University of British Columbia Press.
- Hobson, E. S. 1979. Interactions between piscivorous fishes and heir prey. Pages 231-242 in R.H.
 Stroud and H. Clepper, editors. Predator-prey systems in fisheries management. Sport Fishing
 Institute, Washington D.C.
- Howick, G. L. and W.J. O'Brien. 1983. Piscivorous feeding behavior of largemouth bass: an
 experimental analysis. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 112:508-516.
- Johnson, O.W., W.S. Grant, R.G. Cope, K. Neely, F.W. Waknitz, and R.S. Waples. 1997. Status
 review of chum salmon from Washington, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dept. Commer.,
 NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-32, 280 p.

- Larkin, P.A. 1979. Predator-prey relations in fishes: an overview of the theory. Pages 13-22 in R.H. Stroud and H. Clepper, editors. Predator-prey systems in fisheries management. Sport Fishing Institute, Washington D.C.
- Matthews, G.M. and R.S. Waples. 1991. Status review for Snake River spring and summer chinook salmon. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/NWC-200, 75 p.
- Mesing, C.L. and A.M. Wicker. 1986. Home range, spawning migrations, and homing of radio-tagged Florida largemouth bass in two central Florida lakes. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 115:286-295.
- Myers, J.M., R.G. Kope, G.J. Bryant, D. Teel, L.J. Lieberheimer, T.C. Wainwright, W.S. Grant, F.W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S.T. Lindley, and R.S. Waples. 1998. Status review of chinook salmon from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-35, 443 p.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 1995. Proposed Recovery Plan for Snake River Salmon. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Parente, W.D. and J.G. Smith. 1981. Columbia River Backwater Study Phase II. U.S. Dept of Interior. Fisheries Assistance Office. Vancouver, Washington. 87 pp.
- Petersen, C.J., D.B. Jepsen, R.D. Nelle, R.S. Shively, R.A. Tabor, T.P. Poe. 1990. System-Wide Significance of Predation on Juvenile Salmonids in Columbia and Snake River Reservoirs. Annual Report of Research. Bonneville Power Administration Contract DE-AI79-90BP07096. Project No. 90-078. 53 pp.
- Petersen, J.M. and D.M. Gadomski. 1994. Light-Mediated Predation by Northern Squawfish on Juvenile Chinook Salmon. Journal of Fish Biology 45 (supplement A), 227-242.
- Pflug, D.E. and G.B. Pauley. 1984. Biology of Smallmouth Bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*) in Lake Sammamish, Washington. Northwest Science 58(2):119-130.
- Poe, T.P., H.C. Hansel, S. Vigg, D.E. Palmer, and L.A. Prendergast. 1991. Feeding of Predaceous Fishes on Out-Migrating Juvenile Salmonids in John Day Reservoir, Columbia River. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 120:405-420.
- Raibley, P.T., K.S. Irons, T.M. O'Hara, and K.D. Blodgett. 1997. Winter habitats used by largemouth bass in the Illinois River, a large river-floodplain ecosystem. N. Am. J. Fish. Mgmt. 17:401-412.

- Rieman, B.E. and R.C. Beamesderfer. 1991. Estimated Loss of Juvenile Salmonids to Predation by Northern Squawfish, Walleyes, and Smallmouth Bass in John Day Reservoir, Columbia River. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 120:448-458.
- Salo, E.O. 1991. Life history of chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*). Pages 231-309 *In*: Groot, C. and L. Margolis (eds.). 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia Press.
- Walters, D.A., W.E. Lynch, Jr., and D.L. Johnson. 1991. How depth and interstice size of artificial structures influence fish attraction. N. Am. J. Fish. Mgmt. 11:319-329.
- Wanjala, B.S., J.C. Tash, W.J. Matter and C.D. Ziebell. 1986. Food and habitat use by different sizes of largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) in Alamo Lake, Arizona. Journal of Freshwater Ecology Vol. 3(3):359-368.
- Waples, R.S., O.W. Johnson, and R.P. Jones, Jr. 1991a. Status review for Snake River sockeye salmon. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS F/NWC-195. 23 p.
- Waples, R.S., R.P. Jones, Jr., B.R. Beckman, and G.A. Swan. 1991b. Status review for Snake River fall chinook salmon. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS F/NWC-201. 73 p.
- Ward, D.L. (ed). 1992. Effects of waterway development on anadromous and resident fish in Portland Harbor. Final Report of Research. Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. 48 pp.
- Ward, D.L. and A.A. Nigro. 1992. Differences in Fish Assemblages Among Habitats Found in the Lower Willamette River, Oregon: Application of and Problems With Multivariate Analysis. Fisheries Research 13:119-132.
- Ward, D.L., A.A. Nigro, R.A. Farr, and C.J. Knutsen. 1994. Influence of Waterway Development on Migrational Characteristics of Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Willamette River, Oregon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 14:362-371.
- Ward, D.L., C.J. Knutsen, and R.A. Farr. 1991. Status and biology of black crappie and white crappie in the lower Willamette River near Portland, Oregon. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Fish Division Information Reports Number 91-3. Portland, Oregon. 17 pp.